



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,420	11/12/2003	Robert Murray	006943.00349	6802
66811 7590 05/15/2007 BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD. and ATTORNEYS FOR CLIENT NO. 006943 10 SOUTH WACKER DR. SUITE 3000 CHICAGO, IL 60606			EXAMINER PRATT, HELEN F	
			ART UNIT 1761	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/15/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/706,420

Applicant(s)

MURRAY ET AL.

Examiner

Helen F. Pratt

Art Unit

1761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 May 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 185-212 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 185-212 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 185-212 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Auzerie (FR 2770778 A1) in view of Howard et al. (5,968,544) and Kuznicki et al. (5,681,569) and further in view of Greenleaf (5,447,730).

Auzerie discloses a rehydration solution composition as in claim 185 containing 20-75 meq chloride, from 0-50 meq potassium, and 40-75 meq of sodium. The composition contains water since it is a solution. The osmolality is from 150-350 m.osml. (abstract and page 2, lines 15-24). Claim 185 differs from the reference in the use of 3 types of carbohydrates .

Sucrose and glucose are disclosed as in claim 185 (abstract). Howard et al. disclose that it is known to use starch and sugars in a composition containing electrolytes, flavors, coloring

Art Unit: 1761

agents and clouding (col. 3, lines 55-60, col. 4, lines 5-22), also, claim 199. Kuznicki et al. disclose a beverage containing electrolytes and carbohydrates (abstract and col. 6, lines 10-15). The carbohydrates can be sucrose, corn syrup, high fructose corn syrup and sugar. Nothing critical is seen in the specification as to using three types of carbohydrates (claim 188) or particular amounts as the osmolarity has been disclosed above. The particular amount is seen as being within the skill of the ordinary worker as in claims 189-195. Sucrose is a disaccharide and fructose is a monosaccharide. Both these types of sugars are duplicated in applicants list of carbohydrates and nothing new is seen in the use of other carbohydrates since mono and disaccharides have been disclosed by Auzerie. Therefore, it would have been obvious to use three known carbohydrates in the composition of Auzerie for their known functions particularly since no unexpected results have been shown as to using two carbohydrates instead of three.

Claims 185 and 212 further require that fructose is one of the carbohydrate sources and that the amount of fructose is less than the amount of glucose. However, Greenleaf discloses a beverage with all sources containing glucose in higher amounts than fructose. The maltodextrin is considered to be a source of glucose. No criticality or anything unobvious is seen in using less fructose than glucose. Also, Auzerie discloses the use of 16 g. of glucose and 20 g. of saccharose (sucrose). Since saccharose is made of glucose and fructose, in amounts of 50% each, then saccharose would have had 10 g. of fructose which is less than the amount of glucose as claimed (page 4, lines 1-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to use fructose in lesser amounts as shown by Greenleaf et al. in the composition of the combined references and to use lesser amount of fructose as shown by Auzerie.

Claims 196-198 further require particular amounts of electrolytes. However, the amounts of the references are within or near the claimed amounts. As the claimed osmolality has been shown, it would have been within the skill of the ordinary worker to vary the amounts of electrolytes to achieve the required osmolality. Therefore, it would have been obvious to use particular amounts of electrolytes to achieve a particular osmolality.

The particular amounts of carbohydrate are disclosed as in claims 186-187 by the reference to Auzerie, since the osmolality has been shown, and the claimed amounts of ions as in steps b and c which are sodium and chloride as in claims 196-198 or amounts which are almost in the claimed range as is the chloride of 20-75meq (abstract).

The beverage composition of the combined references is seen to promote fluid retention and stimulate voluntary fluid consumption since the composition has been shown.

Claim 211 is to a concentrate. The concentrate would have to contain water, if it is in solution form. Nothing new is seen in the use of a concentrate, which is merely the same composition with less water. Therefore, it would have been obvious to make a concentrate especially since no amount of water is cited in the abstract of Auzerie, making it possible to add various amounts of water to achieve the particular osmolality.

Various amounts of calcium and magnesium, are disclosed as in claims 199-205 as in Howard et al. (col. 4, lines 11-22). No amounts of flavoring agent are required in claims 206-208. These are well known ingredients common in the use of beverages. The use of particular amounts is seen as being within the skill of the ordinary worker. Howard et al. disclose that it is known to add minerals in amounts to provide the correct osmolarity. Therefore, it would have

been obvious to use additional electrolytes in the composition of Auzerie for their known function and to give the correct osmolarity.

Claims 206 to 209 further require a flavoring agent and a clouding agent. Howard et al. as above discloses such. Particular amounts are seen as being within the skill of the ordinary worker. Therefore, it would have been obvious to use known flavoring agents and clouding agents in particular amounts for their known function in the composition of Auzerie (FR 2770778 A1).

Claim 212 further requires various amounts of ingredients, which have been disclosed above. The particular amount of fluid retention is seen to have been about the same since the osmolality has been shown. The discovery of an optimum value of a result effective variable is ordinarily within the skill of the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 276, 205 USPQ 215, 219 (CCPA 1980). In developing a beverage product, properties such as osmolality and taste are important. It appears that the precise ingredients as well as their proportions affect the osmolality of the product, and thus are result effective variables, which one of ordinary skill in the art would routinely optimize. Therefore, it would have been obvious to use various amounts as disclosed by the combined references.

Claim 210 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the above combined references as applied to the above claims, and further in view of Hutt et al. (6,730,337).

Claim 210 further requires particular amounts of citric acid. Hutt et al. discloses that it is known to use citric acid, calcium in a beverage that has an osmolality at within the claimed osmolality (abstract and col. 2, lines col. 2, lines 17-25, col. 4, lines 15-30). Therefore, it would

have been obvious to use known ingredients such as citric acid for its known function of adding acidity in the composition of the combined references.

ARGUMENTS

Applicant's arguments filed 5-4-07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' argue that the references do not state any motivation to combine the references. The motivation is stated in the obviousness rejection. Applicants argue that Howard teaches away from using the claimed composition in that he uses 63 grams of carbohydrates or 20%, whereas Howard uses 4-10% COH sources and that the composition contains creatine. However, the claims do not exclude the use of creatine. The reference to Howard was used to show that it is known to use sucrose and glucose, and Kuznicki to use COH's such as sucrose, high fructose corn syrup and sugar. No criticality has been shown in the particular amounts of these sugars. Nothing is seen that the ingredients of the composition of Auzerie are not within the claimed range of COH's. At any rate, it would have been obvious to use particular amounts of sugars or COH's at within a known osmolality, depending on how sweet the composition should be. If the reference to Auzerie discloses the claimed osmolality, then it would have been obvious to vary the amounts of ingredients absent a showing of unobvious results using particular amounts of known ingredients.

Auzerie does show 20 meq of chloride and 40-75 meq of sodium, (page 7). It is not seen why applicants are stating that these amounts are not disclosed.

Even though synergy is mentioned in Auzerie, the composition has been shown and is obvious for those reasons.

Howard is used for what it teaches as disclosed above as is Kuznicki. Neither is used to show the whole invention in an obviousness type rejection.

Applicants argue as to a concentrate. As the composition has been shown, it would have been obvious to reduce the amount of water.

Auzerie does show the claimed amounts of ingredients as above or shows amounts which it would have been obvious to vary.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Helen F. Pratt whose telephone number is 571-272-1404. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Milton Cano, can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hp 5-11-07


HELEN PRATT
PRIMARY EXAMINER